UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 9 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

later: Mr. MORADI (Vice-Chairman) Iran (Islamic Republic of)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.23
7 December 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82238 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that to facilitate the Committee's work, all draft resolutions under the disarmament and international security agenda items should be grouped in appropriate clusters. At future meetings, he intended to move from one cluster to another upon completion of each. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed with that procedure.

2. It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

3. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2 under agenda item 81, said that the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean welcomed the prospect of the full entry into force of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco), of which 25 out of the 33 States in the region were now signatories.

4. The preambular part of the draft briefly outlined the background to and history of the Treaty, while prominent features of the operative part were the reference to the joint declaration by the Governments of Argentina, Brazil and Chile regarding the Treaty's imminent entry into force for those countries and the call on those countries of the region which had not done so to follow Mexico's example and ratify the amendments to various articles of the Treaty which had been approved by the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL) in August 1992.

5. For many years, the Latin American and Caribbean region had been a determined advocate of a nuclear-free world. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.21, sponsored by 25 States of the region, was proof of that determination, and his delegation hoped it would be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. HOFFMANN (Germany), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, said that its major purpose was to endorse the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1993, which were intended to assist efforts to find regional solutions to conflicts endangering peace and security at both the regional and global levels.

7. A second purpose of the draft resolution had been to merge previous resolutions and decisions on the same subject, although the sponsors had not been altogether successful in that respect, partly because an effort had been made to ensure that the draft resolution contained only language fully in accordance with the guidelines and recommendations adopted by the Commission. The sponsors believed that it might still be possible to merge draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 with draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36, particularly as the identity of language between the two was far greater than the differences.

(Mr. Hoffmann, Germany)

8. A third purpose of the draft resolution was to ensure the future discussion of regional disarmament in the First Committee. Such a discussion might focus more on individual regional disarmament projects than on principles and guidelines, and that development would contribute to topical and useful work by the First Committee.

9. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30, he said that it was intended to contribute to the successful outcome of the discussion of science and technology at the 1994 session of the Disarmament Commission. The discussion in 1993 had achieved a remarkable convergence of views with respect to the various approaches under discussion, and the draft resolution was intended to reinforce that trend. Its language was based largely on that of General Assembly resolution 47/44, which had been adopted by consensus, and further drew on common language developed at the Disarmament Commission's discussion of the subject in 1993.

10. His country considered that progress in the application of science and technology for disarmament-related purposes would substantially contribute to the full implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. Strong support of the draft resolution by the Committee would be beneficial for the 1994 discussion of science and technology in the Disarmament Commission, and a successful conclusion of the Commission's work would in turn effectively pave the way for a single science and technology resolution in the First Committee in 1994.

11. Mr. JAGUARIBE (Brazil) speaking in support of draft resolution (A/C.1/48/L.30), said it was intended to help reinforce international peace and security and to facilitate access to high technology for peaceful purposes. Its language was the result of careful negotiation and compromise and did not reflect completely the national position of any country, as it was intended to establish common ground between all interested parties, including suppliers and recipients of high technology. Its sponsors called on all delegations to consider the draft resolution positively; its approval would send a clear signal that the United Nations was ready to face new challenges and work together in a changed international environment.

12. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/L.35, said that the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East would be an important contribution to the universal effort to curb nuclear proliferation both regionally and internationally. A turning point in the Middle East region was the agreement signed between Israel and Palestine, which had opened the way to the possibility of lasting and comprehensive peace. There was now well-founded hope that the new accords reached would be implemented in an atmosphere of mutual confidence conforming to the new international climate.

13. The major elements of the draft resolution were consistent with the major goals of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and accession of all States of the area without exception to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. By placing all nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards regime, all States of the region would refrain from stationing, stockpiling or acquiring nuclear weapons on their territory. The draft resolution also contained references to

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

the initiative of establishing a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. The relationship between the two initiatives was clear and would lead to security and confidence in the goals of general disarmament.

14. The balanced and objective study of the Secretary-General entitled "Effective and Verifiable Measures for Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East" (A/45/435) offered many constructive ideas. In addition, document A/48/399 contained a comprehensive review of current political developments. The participation of the United Nations in the negotiating process was a positive step because it allowed parties to benefit from the Organization's broad experience in disarmament issues.

15. His delegation stood ready to continue consultations on the draft resolution with all concerned in order to reach the balanced formula suitable for reflecting those ideas which had gained general consensus in the General Assembly.

16. Mr. GUILLEN (Peru) said that his delegation had agreed to negotiate the merger into draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 of the resolution on regional disarmament that it, along with the European Community, had submitted in 1992, namely General Assembly resolution 47/52. In addition to reaffirming the essential function of the regional approach to disarmament in strengthening international peace and security, the draft resolution stressed a number of important elements at the regional level. The guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the concept of global security adopted by the Disarmament Commission represented a valuable additional element, and his delegation welcomed their inclusion.

17. In recent meetings at the regional level, the President of Peru had reaffirmed his commitment to a significant reduction in military expenditure. Peru believed that the participation of various countries of the region, including Peru, in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was useful, and that the enhancement and broader use of that tool would be a significant step towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

18. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 and encouraged the Committee to make all possible efforts to adopt uniform texts in the near future with a view to rationalizing its work and achieving greater efficiency. As an additional token of its desire to cooperate in the efforts to revitalize the work of the Committee, his delegation had decided to withdraw draft decision A/C.1/48/L.4. Although the subject of conventional disarmament on a regional scale was fully covered in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, his delegation reserved the right to raise the topic independently in the future, depending on the course of events. Furthermore, it had not abandoned its conviction that in the current international situation, there was an even more urgent need to strengthen regional mechanisms of cooperation, confidence-building and disarmament so that greater resources could be devoted to the priority tasks of development.

19. Mr. CHANDRA (India), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22, said that it dealt with the qualitative aspect of disarmament which, until recently, had

(Mr. Chandra, India)

tended to be ignored. The report of the Secretary-General entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security" (A/45/568) bore out those concerns by indicating that in some respects modern technological advances might be hindering rather than helping the pursuit of international security. Over the past three years, the Secretary-General had been requested in successive General Assembly resolutions to continue to follow those developments and to provide a framework for technology assessment guided, inter alia, by the criteria suggested in that report. In his interim report, (A/48/360), the Secretary-General had indicated that he would take note of the outcome of the deliberations on the subject in the Disarmament Commission. The purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22 was mainly to encourage the Secretary-General in his efforts in that regard.

20. Intensive negotiations had been conducted by all concerned to merge the two resolutions on science and technology which were before the Committee. That exercise would have been greatly facilitated if the Disarmament Commission's deliberations had resulted in a consensus paper. It was hoped that the Commission would be able to achieve consensus in 1994, as that would pave the way for a single resolution on the subject. Meanwhile, the two draft resolutions should be regarded as dealing with different strands of the topic.

21. His delegation was confident that the channelling of technological advances to peaceful purposes could only help in creating a better world and a safer security environment. In an interdependent world, global problems required cooperation on a global basis.

22. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.47, said that while very similar to General Assembly resolution 46/26, it had been broadened to cover the need for compliance with obligations stemming not only from agreements but also from other commitments assumed by States, including commitments under Security Council resolutions. Over the past few years, a broad recognition had developed in the United Nations of the vital importance played by compliance in the arms control and disarmament process. In the current year that recognition had been further demonstrated by the fact that the draft resolution was sponsored by more than 50 countries which were broadly representative of the international community.

23. The United States was gratified that compliance by States with their obligations, in particular under arms limitation and disarmament agreements, was now firmly established as a matter of concern to the community of nations; at the same time, it was important for each country to act to remove any doubts that others might have regarding its compliance. Confidence in existing agreements and obligations was an important foundation for future agreements.

24. Although it was not a party to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, the United States was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.3 because it was currently taking steps with a view to ratification. However, its sponsorship of that draft resolution was without prejudice to the ultimate United States decision regarding ratification of the Convention, including the consent of the United States Senate to ratification as required under the United States Constitution.

25. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union with reference to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33, said that the final report of the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts established by the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction indicated that it was possible, at the scientific and technical level, to verify the implementation of that Convention and help increase its effectiveness.

26. The European Union had actively contributed to that report and welcomed its adoption, which would make it possible to continue, at the political level, the exercise undertaken at the scientific and technical level. However, its adoption was only a first stage in the process undertaken in 1991 to provide an effective international verification regime for the Biological Weapons Convention. It was therefore important for a majority of States parties to the Convention to request the depositaries to convene a special conference of States parties to consider the report and decide what action should be taken on it.

27. The 12 member States of the European Union had therefore become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33 and had already requested the depositary States to convene the special conference. They hoped that by the time a vote was taken on the draft resolution, the required number of requests would have been made to enable the General Assembly to take note of the agreement of the States parties to convene the special conference. The European Union believed that transparency, confidence-building measures and verification were fundamental elements of the multilateral approach in the areas of disarmament, security and non-proliferation. It would therefore be particularly regrettable for the 1972 Convention, which banned a whole category of weapons of mass destruction, to have no effective international verification regime.

28. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.41 on behalf of the President of the Conference on Disarmament, said that the decision of the Conference to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban a mandate to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty would undoubtedly make it possible to enhance international peace and security and eliminate the spectre of nuclear war which could annihilate the world. The draft resolution was a demonstration of the political will to arrive at a binding nuclear-test-ban treaty, and reflected the hopes of most of the international community that the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons would be stopped. It also reflected the positive developments which had led to the end of the cold war.

29. The Conference on Disarmament occupied an important place as the only multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament; however, it had been convened under totally different international circumstances and its agenda and methods of work corresponded to the challenges it had faced at that time. It was to be hoped, therefore, that agreement would soon be reached on the expansion of its membership.

30. Mr. COLLINS (Ireland), referring to Ireland's proposal for a code of conduct for conventional arms transfers, said that there had been a strong emphasis in the Committee on weapons of mass destruction and their elimination. However, the Committee could not confine its attention to those weapons which

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

were by their nature the most threatening and destabilizing. It was clear that the greatest risks to stability and security were posed by conventional weapons. In recent years there had been a growing recognition of the importance of conventional arms control; the tragic results of the indiscriminate and irresponsible export and import of arms could be seen in many parts of the world. The draft resolutions on anti-personnel mines were a clear expression of those concerns.

31. A number of positive steps had been taken. The European Union, as well as the five members of the Security Council and the seven major industrialized nations, had each issued declarations expressing concern about the excessive accumulation of conventional weapons in various parts of the world and setting out certain principles and criteria to guide States in their conventional arms policies. The establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms had provided a global instrument for promoting greater transparency in conventional arms transfers. However, transparency did not in itself ensure security; simply reporting information on arms transfers could not absolve States from the responsibility to ensure that their arms imports and exports did not endanger the security of neighbouring States or regions.

32. Ireland envisaged that the proposed code of conduct for conventional arms transfers would be a voluntary instrument which would not limit the right of States to acquire arms for their national security under the United Nations Charter; instead, States would undertake to subscribe voluntarily to a set of principles and criteria in deciding on their arms imports and exports. Since the code would not be a legally binding instrument, it would not need formal verification procedures. However, it should incorporate a mechanism to encourage States to interpret and apply its provisions in a uniform manner. With regard to participation in the code, while arms-producing States had a special responsibility to ensure that their arms exports did not contribute to instability or conflict in other countries or regions, arms-importing countries also had a responsibility to exercise restraint in their arms procurement policies. The dangers posed by excessive accumulations of conventional weapons were not confined to any one region, and the code of conduct should therefore be open to all States.

33. Turning to the question of nuclear disarmament, he said that his delegation considered it to be one of the most important priorities in the area of arms control and disarmament and welcomed the positive steps taken with regard to it in recent years, particularly the suspension by the nuclear Powers of their testing programmes. It must also be recognized, however, that a great deal remained to be done. Public opinion was becoming increasingly concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons and frustrated at the slow pace of progress on nuclear disarmament in the new international environment. His country remained committed to the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons, although it recognized that the goal could not be achieved immediately or without many adjustments; it understood the reluctance of the nuclear Powers to give up the influence their weapons conferred on them, as well as the desire of those States seeking to develop nuclear weapons to acquire the same influence. Ultimately, however, the price of nuclear non-proliferation must be paid by both kinds of States. That was the fundamental covenant embodied in the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT): if the non-nuclear-weapon States, including the threshold nuclear

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

Powers, were to be persuaded to renounce forever the option of developing their own nuclear weapons, then the nuclear Powers would have to show not only a formal commitment to nuclear disarmament but real progress towards the elimination of their nuclear arsenals.

34. His country shared the growing concern at the dangers of nuclear proliferation and supported the efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, in particular through the indefinite extension of the NPT. It urged all States to endorse that objective. It also welcomed the prospect, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, of a consensus resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It was not enough, however, to agree on the objective; it was also necessary to make tangible progress towards it within a reasonable time-frame.

35. The extension of the NPT would also require a major effort, and everything possible must be done to achieve a successful outcome of the 1995 review and extension conference. All countries, including the nuclear Powers, must do what was necessary to reach that goal and, in that context, his delegation hoped that further substantial progress would be made at the next preparatory meeting for the conference in January 1994.

36. Mr. GHAFOORZAI (Afghanistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31, said that the proliferation of conventional weapons in his region was the main cause of the civil strife and instability there. The draft resolution stressed the need for restrictions on the export and sale of such weapons in the interests of national and regional security as well as economic and social development. He drew attention to operative paragraph 1, which invited Member States to take appropriate enforcement measures to halt the illegal export of conventional weapons from their territories. Operative paragraph 2 requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of Governments on an effective mechanism for the collection of such weapons and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

37. Mr. SOEGARDA (Indonesia), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.1, said that while the sponsors welcomed the progress made in the field of nuclear disarmament, they recognized the need for greater efforts so as to ensure the entry into force of the relevant agreements without further delay. They therefore called upon the international community to provide further encouragement to the two major nuclear Powers with a view to eliminating nuclear weapons.

38. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24, he said that recent international developments had highlighted the need for new security arrangements with greater emphasis on regional initiatives. While reaffirming the fundamental role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, the draft resolution was intended to promote collective efforts to strengthen global security.

39. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1, he said that it had been submitted by the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries in view of the increasing interdependence between disarmament and development. It requested the Secretary-General to pursue efforts on the implementation of the action

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

programme adopted at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

40. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25, he said that the proliferation of nuclear weapons continued to pose a serious threat to mankind, and that every avenue should be explored with a view to their elimination. Since the legal implications of the issue had never been addressed, it was proposed to seek an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on whether the threat or use of such arms was permitted under international law.

41. Mr. GOONETILLEKE (Sri Lanka), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5, announced that Algeria, Australia, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Myanmar, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Ukraine and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors. He recalled that at the request of the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament had considered the question of prevention of an arms race in outer space during its 1993 session and had re-established an ad hoc committee for that purpose. The eighteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution reflected the view widely held in the Conference on Disarmament that the conclusion of a relevant international agreement, or agreements, should remain the task of the ad hoc committee and that specific proposals on confidence-building measures should form an integral part of such agreements. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that the mandate of the ad hoc committee would be extended so that it could complete its work in 1994.

42. Mr. CALOVSKI (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) said that the intent of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26 was to promote good-neighbourly relations among the Balkan States and with other nations as a first step towards improving the situation in the Balkan region. To that end, the draft resolution proposed that the issue should be discussed at the fiftieth session of the General Assembly on the basis of a report prepared by the Secretary-General, which it was hoped would not have any serious financial implications.

43. Mr. Young-O SONG (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation had sponsored the two draft resolutions relating to chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons contained in documents A/C.1/48/L.11 and L.33. His country was actively preparing for the effective implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention by initiating ratification procedures and amending its relevant national legislation. However, it was concerned that the non-adherence of certain countries to the Convention would undermine the effectiveness of its implementation. More importantly, the rigorous verification system it provided for might hamper legitimate trade and commerce by the chemical industry. He hoped that those aspects would be given due consideration as part of the preparatory work for the implementation of the Convention. With regard to the Biological Weapons Convention, his delegation supported efforts to strengthen its verification system and the convening of a special conference to evaluate the proposal submitted by the relevant ad hoc group along those lines.

44. With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36, he stressed the importance of regional disarmament efforts in the post-cold-war era in order to

(Mr. Young-O Song, Republic of Korea)

prevent the escalation of regional conflicts. His delegation appreciated the results of the discussions on regional disarmament in the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1993, and endorsed the Commission's conclusion that any regional approach to disarmament must take due account of the specific conditions and characteristics of the region concerned. His delegation welcomed the regional forum of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) scheduled for 1994, and would support similar initiatives aimed at disarmament and the resolution of conflicts at regional and subregional levels in Asia and the Pacific.

45. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.20, noted that the decision to change the name of the World Disarmament Campaign to "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme" had in no way changed the original purpose of the Campaign, which remained that of the broadest possible dissemination of information and opinion on all questions relating to the arms race and war, particularly nuclear war, and, in pursuance of that goal, the United Nations continued to carry out a wide range of activities, including the observance of "Disarmament Week". The draft resolution noted with appreciation the contributions made by the United Nations information centres and regional centres for disarmament and recommended that the Programme should further focus its efforts on the three areas listed. It also invited all Member States to contribute to the Voluntary Trust Fund. In that connection, he noted that his delegation had agreed to the change in name of the Programme on the understanding that the voluntary contributions by some countries to the Fund would be substantially increased. Instead of that increase, there had been a decrease in the current year's contributions as compared with 1992. His delegation would therefore appeal for stronger support of the Programme in future years and, together with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, was confident that it would be approved by the Committee without a vote.

46. The SECRETARY announced that the following countries had become co-sponsors of the draft resolutions listed: A/C.1/48/L.1: Austria; A/C.2/48/L.2/Rev.2: Brazil and Japan; A/C.1/48/L.5: Bolivia and Brazil; A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1: Bolivia; A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.1: Bolivia, Honduras and Norway; A/C.1/48/L.9: Ecuador and Rwanda; A/C.1/48/L.10: Rwanda; A/C.1/48/L.11: Bolivia, Chile, Estonia, Gabon, Kyrgyzstan, Malta and Tunisia; A/C.1/48/L.12: Bolivia; A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2: Honduras; A/C.1/48/L.14: Jamaica, Nepal and Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.16: Austria, Bolivia and Greece; A/C.1/48/L.17: Bolivia; A/C.1/48/L.18: Bolivia, Chile, Estonia, Malta, Nicaragua and Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.20: Honduras and Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.22: Honduras and Nigeria; A/C.1/48/L.23: Honduras; A/C.1/48/L.27: Spain and Trinidad and Tobago; A/C.1/48/L.28: Netherlands, Nicaragua and Turkey; A/C.1/48/L.29: Costa Rica and Honduras; A/C.1/48/L.30: Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Greece, Honduras, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Romania and Russian Federation; A/C.1/48/L.32: Croatia, Honduras and New Zealand; A/C.1/48/L.33: Chile, Costa Rica, Honduras and Turkey; A/C.1/48/L.34: Costa Rica, Honduras, Portugal and Bolivia; A/C.2/48/L.35: Honduras; A/C.1/48/L.36: Honduras, Netherlands, Nicaragua and United Kingdom; A/C.1/48/L.40: Azerbaijan, Chad, Costa Rica, Estonia, Gabon, Greece, Honduras, Kenya, Maldives, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Togo and Venezuela; A.C.1/48/L.41: Czech Republic; A/C.1/48/L.42: Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Greece, Malta and Slovakia; A/C.2/48/L.44/Rev.1: Belgium, Greece and

(The Secretary)

Portugal; A/C.1/48/L.47: Costa Rica; A/C.1/48/L.48: Bahrain, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman and Tunisia.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.